

1-31-94

Dear Mr. Weisberg:

Thanks for answering the letter I wrote you a little over a year ago. Since then I have continued to research the Kennedy assassination, mostly through secondary sources. Ironically, the friend of mine in California who first piqued my interest in this subject, and who believed there was a conspiracy to kill JFK, now believes Oswald did it alone. My own position is that although he probably was privy to a conspiracy, he did not shoot Kennedy. I don't think he shot Tippit either.

What troubles me is that reading Gerald Posner's book of last fall changed his mind. In my opinion, Posner's book is full of deception. In a number of places he falsifies statements made in the books of various critics, in order to discredit them. A case in point is his so-called citation of a statement Jean Hill made which Jim Marrs quoted in his book. Posner says, Marrs says that Jean Hill's testimony before the Warren Commission is a fabrication from start to finish. What Marrs actually said was that Hill said that her testimony as represented in the 26 volumes was largely a fabrication by the Commission. His version gives concerning some of the theories, (e.g. the tramps including E. Howard Hunt, etc) are pointless, since the more responsible critics have already discredited these. What Posner wants to get you to think is that since many of the conspiracy theories are flawed, then there couldn't have been a conspiracy. (over)

the so-called mysterious deaths, some of them, perhaps most of them were not related to the case. But some of them were related to the coverup.

To make matters worse, both in print and on the radio, Posner purported to begin his investigation with no predisposition to either the lone-assassin theory or to ~~the~~ a conspiracy theory. Yet Random House falls over itself to get him to write a book, which is tendentious from the start, and which tries to discredit or manages to omit, any witness ~~would~~ or evidence which doesn't support the official theory. Another tactic of his is to find somebody or something nearly everyone serious about the subject finds fault with, e.g., Oliver Stone, and then use <sup>Stone's</sup> lack of credibility to discredit anybody who had anything to do with his film. No doubt some associated with him were "queeks" but I see no reason to siftison everyone who collaborated or associated with him. To do that would be similar to discounting everyone mentioned as possible suspects, or, at least, sources of information, from New Orleans, because of Garrison's lack of a case against Shaw. I would be interested in your opinion of his book.

Some other questions in my mind arise. I think it's clear from your books that you believe there was a conspiracy. But do you think any of the conspiracy books have merit? Or do you feel that the matter should be dropped now, since the most that can be done is to show that Oswald couldn't have done what the Warren Commission said he did? I guess what I'm getting at is this. Is it a total waste

-2-

1-31-91

of time to read more books, since, as you wrote me, "The crime itself was not investigated." What about the value of Dr. Charles Crenshaw's book? Admittedly, this came far too late, but I don't think it's a simple bid to make money, either.

Regards,  
Royce Bierma

2/5/94

Royce Bierma  
3522 Curtis St.,  
Hudsonville, MI 49426

Dear Mr. Bierma,

ASorry I do not have time for a longer response and comment.

You ask if I think any of the conspiracy books are any good. This requires some division, first into fiction and non-fiction and then the supposed kind of non-fiction.

In a novel a writer has the right to say whatever he believes no matter how wrong because he presents it as a novel.

If allegedly non-fiction and the book pretends a solution it is not a good book and it deceives and misleads the people for the reasons I have already given you.

There are some conspiracy books that pretend they have a factual basis. Of those I have read not one has the factual basis represented and the sources in some range from the very questionable to prevaricators or the irrational.

Unless one checks all the sources, and this is particularly true of Posner, one has no way of knowing if the source is quoted faithfully.

I think it is important to understand what the government has done and to try to get the government to be truthful. So this effort is not a waste of time.

Nor is it a waste of time to tell the people what truth can be told so they can understand more than the truth about the crime - how the institutions of their society worked or failed to work so they can try to do something about it, whatever the odds may be.

I am 80, unwell, and I have two more books coming out this year. They will not be published by me and they will be in the bookstores. Please do not ask me any questions about them, they will be available and they will speak for themselves.

Please try to remember that at my age and in the state of my health every letter I write to answer questions is at the cost of something else I'll never be able to do.

Sincerely,

*Huddleston*